



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/153,369	09/15/1998	JAMES P. KETRENOS	INTL-0075-US	5432

21906 7590 02/26/2004

TROP PRUNER & HU, PC  
8554 KATY FREEWAY  
SUITE 100  
HOUSTON, TX 77024

EXAMINER
----------

LONSBERRY, HUNTER B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

dm

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/153,369

**Applicant(s)**

KETRENOS, JAMES P.

**Examiner**

Hunter B. Lonsberry

**Art Unit**

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 November 2002.  
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-15 and 17-35 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☒ Claim(s) 9-12,21-27,30 and 31 is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6,8,12,14,15,18,28,29,32,33 and 35 is/are rejected.  
7) ☒ Claim(s) 5,7,17,20 and 34 is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 September 1998 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 12, 14, 18, 28, 29, 32, 33 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,903,728 to Semenzato in view of U.S. Patent 6,404,975-B1 to Bopardikar.

Regarding claims 1 and 13, Semenzato discloses a method for accessing a video stream via a web browser with a video player plugin, the browser and plugin are run as two separate processes with the plugin retrieving and playing video streams from a video server, if the plugin crashes, access is maintained to the video stream as the connection data is saved in order to be made available to the next created instance of the plugin (column 7, line 35-column 8, line 43, column 9, lines 4-45). Semenzato is silent regarding shutting down the video stack. Bopardikar discloses a video storage system which uses data striping across multiple hard disks to store video, when a failure occurs, the video stack is shut down in order for a healing procedure to be preformed, to remedy the problem and prevent the corruption of data (column 5, lines 22-49, column

Art Unit: 2611

26, line 23-column 27, line 25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify Semenzato to shut down the video stack upon detection of a crash, in order to prevent the data from being corrupted as taught by Bopardikar.

Regarding claims 2 and 14, Semenzato discloses detecting when the first application fails (column 7, line 35-column 8).

Regarding claims 6 and 18, Semenzato discloses that the plugins are run as separate processes and are stored in different memory spaces (Figures 2C and 3, column 6, lines 43-64).

Regarding claim 8, Semenzato discloses that the plug in applications are responsible for accessing the video server (column 7, line 35-column 8, line 43, column 9, lines 4-45). The video servers disclosed in Semenzato inherently contain software for accessing the video stack, as without such software, no data could be transferred between the server and a client application.

Regarding claims 28, 29, 32, 33 and 35, Semenzato discloses a method for accessing a video stream via a web browser with a video player plugin, the browser and plugin are run as two separate processes with the plugin retrieving and playing video streams from a video server, if the plugin crashes, access is maintained to the video stream as the connection data is saved in order to be made available to the next created instance of the plugin (column 7, line 35-column 8, line 43, column 9, lines 4-45). Semenzato is silent regarding shutting down the video stack. Bopardikar discloses a video storage system which uses data striping across multiple hard disks to

store video, when a failure occurs, the video stack is shut down in order for a healing procedure to be preformed, to remedy the problem and prevent the corruption of data (column 5, lines 22-49, column 26, line 23-column 27, line 25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify Semenzato to shut down the video stack upon detection of a crash, in order to prevent the data from being corrupted as taught by Bopardikar.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3 and 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,903,728 to Semenzato in view of U.S. Patent 6,404,975-B1 to Bopardikar in further view of U.S. Patent 5,440,726 to Fuchs.

Regarding claims 3 and 15, Semenzato discloses a method for accessing a video stream via a web browser with a video player plugin, the browser and plugin are run as two separate processes with the plugin retrieving and playing video streams from a video server, if the plugin crashes, access is maintained to the video stream as the connection data is saved in order to be made available to the next created instance of the plugin (column 7, line 35-column 8, line 43, column 9, lines 4-45).

Semenzato/Bopardikar do not disclose the monitoring of an exception handler to detect a crash. Fuchs discloses a system which monitors errors in an application via watchdog,

Art Unit: 2611

it then rolls back to various checkpoints in the processes and reconstructs the data from where the exception occurred in order to restore the original state of the application (column 7, line 40-column 8, line 16, column 9, lines 11 -36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify Semenzato and Bopardikar to monitor an exception handler as taught by Fuchs in order to allow rapid recovery of a crashed application so that the crash and restoration of an application would be transparent to the user.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 5, 7, 17, 20, and 34 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 9-12, 21-27 30 and 31 are allowed.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent 5,278,838 to Ng: Recovery From Errors in a Redundant Array of Disk Drives.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hunter B. Lonsberry whose telephone number is 703-305-3234. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday during normal business hours.

Art Unit: 2611

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile can be reached on 703-305-4380. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HBL



VIVEK SRIVASTAVA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER